



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/783,383

02/20/2004

David D. Zito

600189-145

6406

76041 7590 08/19/2010

YAHOO! INC.

C/O Ostrow Kaufman & Frankl LLP

The Chrysler Building

405 Lexington Avenue, 62nd Floor

NEW YORK, NY 10174

EXAMINER

HENRY, RODNEY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/19/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sformicola@okfllp.com

dwalcott@okfllp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/783,383	Applicant(s) ZITO ET AL.	
	Examiner RODNEY HENRY	Art Unit 3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-10,21,22,24,26 and 30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,11-20,23,25,27-29,31-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a non-final office action on the merits. The Examiner acknowledges communication from the Applicant dated 4/28/2010 in which claims 1, 4, and 33 were amended. Claims 8-10, 21, 22, 24, 26, and 30 were previously canceled. Claims 34-41 were added. Therefore claims 1-7, 11-20, 23, 25, 27-29, 31, and 33-41 are pending and are considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1, 3-7, 13, 27-29, 31-33, and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spivack et al. (US 20040230676), in view of Clay (US 20050131724), and further in view of Kida (US 20020013729).**

As per Claim 1:

Spivack et al. discloses in a networked computer system, a computerized method for facilitating a transaction between at least an advertiser and an advertisee for arranging for presentation of an advertisement to at least one user of a computerized device, the method comprising:

obtaining, at an offer exchange server, an advertiser offer comprising conditions including a first set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertiser for presentation of the advertisement to the user;

obtaining, at an offer exchange server;

using the advertiser offer conditions, and the obtained user context information, electronically, determining via a processing device, a match between the advertiser offer, and the user context;

electronically, via the processing device, arranging for presentation of the advertisement to the user based on the match indicating the user context information matches the advertiser offer conditions and the advertisee offer conditions (see paragraph [0197] via semcard offer or request offer target to selected parties, [0191] via user route and match offers, [0216] via transfer of files and buying and selling things, [0263] via matching in the user's context).

Spivack et al. does not explicitly disclose an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user; the advertisee offer conditions, the advertisee offer;

obtaining, at an offer exchange server, user context information that indicates the context of the activities of the user.

However, Clay discloses an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user; the advertisee offer conditions, the advertisee offer (see claim 18, and paragraph [0035] via offer to buy postings (ie advertisee wanted items postings).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user; the advertisee offer conditions, the advertisee offer to the system of Spivack et al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to allow users (advertisees) to make requests for items.

Kida further discloses obtaining, at an offer exchange server, user context information that indicates the context of the activities of the user (see paragraph [0067] and FIG. 13 via user).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add obtaining, at an offer exchange server, user context information that indicates the context of the activities of the user to the system of Spivack et al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to ensure offers are closely tied to members' schedules such that the transactions will be accepted.

As per Claim 3:

Spivack et. al. discloses facilitating arranging for presentation of the advertisement to an online Internet-based user (see FIG. 8 and paragraph [0007]).

As per Claim 4:

Spivack et. al. discloses a system for facilitating a transaction between at least an advertiser and an advertisee for arranging for presentation of an advertisement to at least one user of a computerized device, the system comprising:

Art Unit: 3622

means for obtaining, at an offer exchange server, an advertiser offer comprising conditions including a first set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertiser for presentation of the advertisement to the user; means for obtaining, at an offer exchange server;

means for using the advertiser offer conditions, and the obtained user context information, determining a match between the advertiser offer, and the user context;

and means for arranging for presentation of the advertisement to the user based on the match indicating the user context information matches the advertiser offer conditions and the advertisee offer conditions (see paragraph [0197] via semcard offer or request offer target to selected parties, [0191] via user route and match offers, [0216] via transfer of files and buying and selling things, [0263] via matching in the user's context).

Spivack et al. does not explicitly disclose an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user; the advertisee offer conditions, the advertisee offer;

obtaining, at an offer exchange server, user context information that indicates the context of the activities of the user.

However, Clay discloses an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user; the advertisee offer conditions, the

Art Unit: 3622

advertiser offer (see claim 18, and paragraph [0035] via offer to buy postings (ie advertiser wanted items postings).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add an advertiser offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertiser for presentation of the advertisement to the user; the advertiser offer conditions, the advertiser offer to the system of Spivack et al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to allow users (advertisers) to make requests for items.

Kida discloses obtaining, at an offer exchange server, user context information that indicates the context of the activities of the user (see paragraph [0067] and FIG. 13 via user).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add obtaining, at an offer exchange server, user context information that indicates the context of the activities of the user to the system of Spivack et al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to ensure offers are closely tied to members' schedules such that the transactions will be accepted.

As per Claim 5:

Spivack et. al. discloses a system for facilitating a transaction between at least an advertiser and an advertiser for arranging for presentation of an advertisement to at least one user of a computerized device, the system comprising:
one or more offer exchange server computers connected to a network;

Art Unit: 3622

one or more offer exchange databases connected to the network and accessible by the one or more offer exchange server computers, the one or more offer exchange databases storing information comprising:

an advertiser offer comprising conditions including a first set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertiser for presentation of the advertisement to the user;

wherein the one or more offer exchange server computers:

using the advertiser offer conditions, the advertisee offer conditions, and the user context information, determine a match between the advertiser offer, the advertisee offer, and the user context; and if the match exists, facilitate arranging for presentation of the advertisement to the user (see paragraph [0045] and FIG. 28 via showing routing of semcards using servers in a peer-to-peer network, [0263] via matching in the user's context).

Spivack et al. does not explicitly disclose an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user; user context information that indicates the context of the activities of the user.

However, Kida discloses an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user; user context information that indicates the context of the activities of the user (see paragraph [0067] and FIG. 13 via user and [0106] via user conditions).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user; user context information that indicates the context of the activities of the user to the system of Spivack et al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to ensure offers are closely tied to members' schedules such that the transactions will be accepted.

As per Claim 6:

Spivack et. al. discloses the one or more offer exchange server computers obtain, and cause to be stored in the offer exchange database, the advertiser offer, and the user context information (see paragraph [0072], [0197] via semcard offer or request offer target to selected parties).

Spivack et al. does not explicitly disclose the advertisees offer.

However, Clay discloses the advertisees offer (see claim 18, and paragraph [0035] via offer to buy postings (ie advertisee wanted items postings).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the advertisees offer to the system of Spivack et al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to allow users (advertisees) to make requests for items.

As per Claim 7:

Spivack et. al. discloses the system facilitates a plurality of transactions between advertisers and advertisees, and wherein the database contains a plurality of advertiser

Art Unit: 3622

offers and information regarding a plurality of computer user contexts (see paragraph [0197] via semcard offer or request offer target to selected parties, [0191] via user route and match offers, [0216] via transfer of files and buying and selling things, [0263] via matching in the user's context)).

Spivack et al. does not explicitly disclose a plurality of advertisees offers.

However, Clay discloses a plurality of advertisees offers (see claim 18, and paragraph [0035] via offer to buy postings (ie advertisee wanted items postings).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a plurality of advertisees offers the system of Spivack et al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to allow users (advertisees) to make requests for items.

As per Claim 13:

Spivack et. al. discloses one or more advertiser computers connected to the network; one or more advertisee computers connected to the network; and one or more user computerized devices connected to the network (see paragraph [0108, 0287] via advertiser network).

As per Claim 27:

Spivack et al. discloses the marketplace operator provides virtual marketplaces in multi-dimensional offers (see paragraph [0160]).

As per Claim 28:

Spivack et. al. discloses using information stored in the database to determine dimensional ranges of values of dimensions of a pre-defined offer such that the pre-

Art Unit: 3622

defined offer specifies at least one user context to which advertisements of a particular category are well-targeted (see paragraphs [0073, 0140, 0080]).

As per Claim 29:

Spivack et. al. discloses the offer exchange server comprises an offer exchange engine, and wherein the offer exchange engine comprises programming comprising a plurality of virtual offer exchange machines including at least one of an offer management machine, an offer resolution control machine, and offer retrieval machine, and offer sorting machine, an offer campaign machine, and an offer distribution machine (see paragraph [0160] via virtual communications channel, [0108, 0153, 0154] via virtual objects and semcard management, and relationship management).

As per Claim 31:

Spivack et. al. discloses generating the pre-defined offers, and wherein at least one of matching, generating pre-defined offers, and comprising directing pre-defined offers utilizing at least one of one of a data mining program and an artificial intelligence program (see paragraph [0080]).

As per Claim 32:

Spivack et. al. discloses comprising, in matching, comparing stored offers with user context information as such user context information is obtained (see paragraph [0197] via semcard offer or request offer target to selected parties, [0191] via user route and match offers).

As per Claim 33:

Spivack et. al. discloses a computer usable medium or media storing program code which, when executed on one or more computerized devices, causes the computerized devices to execute a computerized method for facilitating a transaction between at least an advertiser and an advertisee for arranging for presentation of an advertisement to at least one user of a computerized media outlet of the advertisee, the method comprising: obtaining, at an offer exchange server, an advertiser offer comprising a first set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertiser for presentation of the advertisement to the user; obtaining, at an offer exchange server; obtaining, at an offer exchange server, user context information including information relating to the first and second sets of user context conditions; using the obtained user context information, determining whether the user context satisfies the first and second sets of user context conditions; and if the user context satisfies the first and second sets of conditions, facilitating arranging for presentation of the advertisement to the user on a real-time or almost real-time basis (see paragraph [0197] via semcard offer or request offer target to selected parties, [0191] via user route and match offers, [0216] via transfer of files and buying and selling things, [0263] via matching in the user's context, [0013] via instant message and advertising).

Spivack et al. does not explicitly disclose an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user.

However, Clay discloses an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user (see claim 18, and paragraph [0035] via offer to buy postings (ie advertisee wanted items postings).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add an advertisee offer comprising conditions including a second set of one or more user context conditions required by the advertisee for presentation of the advertisement to the user to the system of Spivack et al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to allow users (advertisees) to make requests for items.

As per Claim 35:

Spivack et. al. discloses the advertisement facilitates sale of a product, a service, or content (see paragraph [0014] via products and services).

As per Claim 36:

Spivack et. al. discloses the computerized device is selected from a group including a desktop computer, a notebook computer, a wireless computerized device, a portable computerized device, and a handheld computerized device (see paragraph [0108] via desktop applications).

As per Claim 37:

Spivack et al. discloses determining whether a match exists comprises performing probabilistic matching (see paragraph [0310, 0311] via statistics and matching).

As per Claim 38:

Spivack et al. discloses application of catalyzers to offers to facilitate effective offer matching (see paragraph [0073, 0140]).

As per Claim 39:

Spivack et al. discloses the one or more dimensions comprise resolutions or (see paragraph [0034]).

3. Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spivack et al. (US 20040230676), in view of Clay (US 20050131724), in view of Kida (US 20020013729), and further in view of Kawahara et al. (US 20020184096).

As per Claim 2:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose obtaining a multi-dimensional advertiser offer and a multi-dimensional advertisee offer.

However, Kawahara et al. discloses obtaining a multi-dimensional advertiser offer and a multi-dimensional advertisee offer (see paragraph [0108] via historical tracking).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add obtaining a multi-dimensional advertiser offer and a multi-dimensional advertisee offer to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to allow for historical tracking of offer transactions.

As per Claim 14:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the offers each comprise one or more dimensions.

However, Kawahara et al. discloses the offers each comprise one or more dimensions (see paragraphs [0108]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the offers each comprise one or more dimension to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to allow for historical tracking of offer transactions

4. Claims 11, 12, 25 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spivack et al. (US 20040230676), in view of Clay (US 20050131724), in view of Kida (US 20020013729), and further in view of Patel et al. (US 20040103024).

As per Claim 11:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the one or more offer exchange servers are marketplace operator servers, and wherein the advertisee is an affiliate of a marketplace operator.

However Patel et al. discloses the one or more offer exchange servers are marketplace operator servers, and wherein the advertisee is an affiliate of a marketplace operator (see paragraph [0158]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the one or more offer exchange servers are

Art Unit: 3622

marketplace operator servers, and wherein the advertisee is an affiliate of a marketplace operator to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to manage click impressions.

As per Claim 12:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the marketplace operator obtains a fee from at least one of the advertiser and the advertisee in connection with facilitating the transaction.

However Patel et al. discloses the marketplace operator obtains a fee from at least one of the advertiser and the advertisee in connection with facilitating the transaction (see paragraph [0720]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the marketplace operator obtains a fee from at least one of the advertiser and the advertisee in connection with facilitating the transaction to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to compensate facilitators.

As per Claim 25:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose selected proposed pre-defined offers can be at least one of modified and at least partially configured.

However Patel et al. discloses selected proposed pre-defined offers can be at least one of modified and at least partially configured (see paragraph [0202]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add selected proposed pre-defined offers can be

Art Unit: 3622

at least one of modified and at least partially configured to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to ensure offer acceptance.

As per Claim 40:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose selected pre-defined offers can be partially configured by choosing at least one desired resolution of a dimension.

However Patel et al. discloses selected pre-defined offers can be partially configured by choosing at least one desired resolution of a dimension (see paragraph [0202]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add selected pre-defined offers can be partially configured by choosing at least one desired resolution of a dimension to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to ensure effective offers.

5. Claims 15-20, 23, 34, 35, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spivack et al. (US 20040230676), in view of Clay (US 20050131724), in view of Kida (US 20020013729), and further in view of Llach (US 20040186776).

As per Claim 15:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the one or more dimensions comprise resolutions.

However Llach discloses the one or more dimensions comprise resolutions or (see paragraph [0034]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the one or more dimensions comprise resolutions to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to manage offers in terms date and time ranges.

As per Claim 16:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the offers each comprise a search term-related dimension.

However Llach discloses the offers each comprise a search term-related dimension (see paragraph [0038]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the offers each comprise a search term-related dimension to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to manage search offers in terms date and time ranges.

As per Claim 17:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the offers each comprise a user location-related dimension.

However, Llach discloses the offers each comprise a user location-related dimension (see paragraph [0026, 0097]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the offers each comprise a user location-

Art Unit: 3622

related dimension to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to gauge interest of customers by location.

As per Claim 18:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the user location related dimension is a real-time or almost real time physical location of the user.

However, Llach discloses the user location related dimension is a real-time or almost real time physical location of the user (see paragraph [0026, 0083]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the user location related dimension is a real-time or almost real time physical location of the user to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to gauge interest of customers by location in real-time.

As per Claim 19:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the dimensions include at least one of user context-related dimensions, media, content, demographics, and price.

However, Llach discloses the dimensions include at least one of user context-related dimensions, media, content, demographics, and price (paragraphs [0014, 0015]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the dimensions include at least one of user context-related dimensions, media, content, demographics, and price to the system of

Art Unit: 3622

Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to determine the effectiveness of campaigns.

As per Claim 20:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the dimensions include at least one of price per click, price per impression, and a price per user acquisition.

However, Llach discloses the dimensions include at least one of price per click, price per impression, and a price per user acquisition (see paragraph [0001, 0021, 0077]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the dimensions include at least one of price per click, price per impression, and a price per user acquisition to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to determine the effectiveness of campaigns.

As per Claim 23:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the offer exchange database comprises aggregated information useful in advertisement targeting and obtained from a plurality of affiliates; the one or more offer exchange servers utilize the aggregated information to determine pre-defined offers considered well suited to particular categories of at least one of advertisers and advertisees;

and the one or more offer exchange servers propose pre-defined offers to at least one of advertisers and advertisees of appropriate categories for selection (see paragraph.

However, Llach discloses the offer exchange database comprises aggregated information useful in advertisement targeting and obtained from a plurality of affiliates; the one or more offer exchange servers utilize the aggregated information to determine pre-defined offers considered well suited to particular categories of at least one of advertisers and advertisees;

and the one or more offer exchange servers propose pre-defined offers to at least one of advertisers and advertisees of appropriate categories for selection (see paragraph [0101]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the offer exchange database comprises aggregated information useful in advertisement targeting and obtained from a plurality of affiliates; the one or more offer exchange servers utilize the aggregated information to determine pre-defined offers considered well suited to particular categories of at least one of advertisers and advertisees;

and the one or more offer exchange servers propose pre-defined offers to at least one of advertisers and advertisees of appropriate categories for selection to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to develop offers based on previous performance and specific categories.

As per Claim 34:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the advertisement comprises at least one of text, imagery, and sound to be presented through the computerized device of the computer user.

Art Unit: 3622

However, Llach discloses the advertisement comprises at least one of text, imagery, and sound to be presented through the computerized device of the computer user (see paragraph [0034]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the advertisement comprises at least one of text, imagery, and sound to be presented through the computerized device of the computer user to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to develop a wide ranged of ad types.

As per Claim 35:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the advertisement facilitates sale of a product, a service, or content.

However, Llach discloses the advertisement comprises at least one of text, imagery, and sound to be presented through the computerized device of the computer user (see paragraph [0034]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the advertisement comprises at least one of text, imagery, and sound to be presented through the computerized device of the computer user to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to develop a wide ranged of ad types.

As per Claim 41:

Spivack et. al. does not explicitly disclose the network comprises a wireless network, and comprising wireless transmission of the advertisement to the user.

However, Llach discloses the network comprises a wireless network, and comprising wireless transmission of the advertisement to the user (see paragraph [0029]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the network comprises a wireless network, and comprising wireless transmission of the advertisement to the user to the system of Spivack et. al.. One would have been motivated to do this in order to support mobile devices.

Response to Arguments

6. The applicant's arguments are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection above.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney M. Henry whose telephone number is 571-270-5102. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday from 7:30 am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 571-272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-6102.

Art Unit: 3622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rmh

/Arthur Duran/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622